UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff.

11 JEHAN ZEB MIR, M.D.,

Civil No. 12cv2340-GPC (DHB)

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA.

ORDER REGARDING
PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE
APPLICATION TO COMPEL
WHITNEY TO ANSWER

DEPOSITION QUESTION

Defendants.

[ECF No. 190]

et al.,

On August 10, 2016, Plaintiff Jehan Zeb Mir, M.D. ("Plaintiff") filed an *ex parte* motion requesting the Court compel Linda K. Whitney to answer a deposition question. (ECF No. 190.) The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's motion, and notes that Plaintiff has failed to comply with this Court's procedures for filing discovery motions. Specifically, Plaintiff has not complied with Section IV.C. of the undersigned Magistrate Judge's Civil Chambers Rules which requires the filing of a Joint Motion for Determination of Discovery Dispute. Moreover, it appears Plaintiff did not meet and confer with defense counsel prior

¹ The Chambers Rules are available at:

https://www.casd.uscourts.gov/Rules/Lists/Rules/Attachments/17/Bartick%20 Civil%20 Chambers%20 Rules.pdf

to filing the instant motion. The duty to meet and confer prior to bringing a discovery motion is well established. It is required not only by this Court's Chambers Rules and the Southern District's Civil Local Rules, but also by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a) (a motion to compel discovery "must include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party filing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action"); Civ. L.R. 26.1(a) ("The Court will entertain no motion pursuant to Rules 26 through 37, Fed. R. Civ. P, unless counsel will have previously met and conferred concerning all disputed issues.") In addition, Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court's rules governing *ex parte* applications. *See* Civ. L. R. 83.3(h)(2).

Plaintiff has been admonished several times that he must comply with the Court's rules. See ECF Nos. 146 at 2; 169 at 2-3; 170 at 2-3; 174 at 3-4; 175 at 3. Further, Plaintiff has been specifically and repeatedly warned that the failure to comply will result in motions not being considered. See ECF No. 169 at 3 ("Plaintiff is advised that any future discovery motion filed after the date of this Order will not be considered unless the Court's rules and procedures are complied with."). See also ECF Nos. 170 at 2-3; 174 at 3-4; 175 at 3.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 23, 2016

DAVID H. BARTICK

United States Magistrate Judge